



No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION —SEPTEMBER 1, 2003 SUBMISSION—

For State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/pdf/wiplan9-03.pdf>

Elizabeth Burmaster
State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
Madison, Wisconsin



September 2003

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, creed, pregnancy, marital or parental status, sexual orientation, or physical, mental, emotional or learning disability.

Table of Contents

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission.....	iv
Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission.....	iv
Transmittal Instructions	v
ESEA Goals and ESEA Indicators.....	1
Performance Indicator 2.1	1
A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments.....	2
B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1	3
C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Outcomes) for English Language Proficiency	6
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1.....	11
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2.....	15
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3.....	16
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1.....	17
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1.....	18
Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2.....	21
Appendixes	
Appendix A—Conversion Charts for Wisconsin English Language Learner (ELL) Student Levels	A-1
Appendix B—Final Report: Standards (Cutpoint)-Setting on the LAS and IPT Exams for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction	B-1
Appendix C—English Language Proficiency Levels.....	C-1

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA Goals and ESEA Indicators

Performance Indicator 2.1: *The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.*

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**
- **Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)**

State Response

The State of Wisconsin is working with the WIDA (Wisconsin, Delaware, and Arkansas—the original states submitting the grant proposal) Consortium of states (current SEA members include Wisconsin, Delaware, Arkansas, Washington DC Public Schools, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont) to produce a comprehensive series of English language proficiency (ELP) standards that will meet NCLB requirements and reflect best practice for English language learners (ELLs). Our core standards will be available in final form within the next two months. The core standards will guide development of our ELP test specifications and subsequent test item development. The ELP test will be piloted in spring 2004, with field testing in fall 2004 and final roll out beginning in spring 2005.

The core standards focus on measurable performance objectives and address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They are linked to academic standards from all the consortium states in English language arts, reading, math, science, and social studies. Early in 2004, additional versions of the ELP standards will be issued that build upon the foundation of the core standards. These expanded versions will be used in staff development efforts within WIDA states. The expanded ELP standards will be arranged for curriculum planners, administrators, and teachers to facilitate their usefulness as planning documents. They will include additional standards or objectives linked to states' standards that may not be amenable to large-scale assessment, such as procedural knowledge, learning strategies objectives, etc.

Our core standards were initially drafted on May 15-16, 2003, in Madison, Wisconsin. All eight partner states were present and participated in this development. Also present were key WIDA consortium consultants who are national experts in standards development and assessment for ELLs. These experts included: Margo Gottlieb, Illinois Resource Center; Fred Davidson, University of Illinois; Meg Malone and Jim Bauman, the Center for Applied Linguistics; and Charlene Rivera, Center for Equity and Excellence in Education. Margo Gottlieb compiled the work of individual state teams based on the consensus of the consortium partners (June/July 2003). Selected teachers, administrators and ELL experts reconvened at the Center for Applied Linguistics office in Washington DC, August 11-12, 2003, to review the draft and make final recommendations for changes. Deborah Short, Center for Applied Linguistics, and Lorraine Valdez Pierce, George Mason University, also participated in the formal review of the first draft.

The WIDA Consortium English Language Proficiency Standards will address grades K-12 using grade clusters of K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. These standards parallel the forms of the new standards-based ELP test currently under construction.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- *Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);*
- *Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and*
- *A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.*

2. The baseline data should:

- *Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and*
- *Be aggregated at the State level.*
- *If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:*
 - *Describe how the composite score was derived;*
 - *Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and*
 - *Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.*

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

Wisconsin has authorized four ELP assessments:

- **LAS**
- **IPT**
- **Woodcock-Muñoz**
- **MAC II**

Please note that proficiency level data have not been collected by assessment instrument to date. Our data collection software will be revised to include LEP students identified by assessment instrument for the next data collection, which will include March 2004 Census Data and 2003-04 School Year Data.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s): **32,588**

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

The data in the following chart are from the 2001-02 school year. They are the most recent data available. The department is in the process of collecting data from the 2002-03 school year, which should be ready by the end of the calendar year. They will be provided to OELA as soon as they are available.

Baseline Data for 2001-02 (2002-03 data will be provided when available)							
ELP Assessment	Total No. LEP identified	No. and % at Level 1	No. and % at Level 2	No. and % at Level 3	No. and % at Level 4	No. and % at Level 5	No. and % at Level 6
N/A – see note in previous section	34,623	5,483 15.8%	4,759 13.7%	8,101 23.4%	7,829 22.6%	6,416 18.5%	2,035 5.9%

Wisconsin Levels/Level Names:

- Level 1: Beginning/Pre-Production
- Level 2: Beginning/Production
- Level 3: Intermediate
- Level 4: Advanced Intermediate
- Level 5: Advanced
- Level 6: Fully English Proficient (formerly Limited-English Proficient)

Please provide the following additional information:

1. *English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).*

See Appendix A—Conversion Charts for Wisconsin English Language Learner (ELL) Student Levels.

2. *Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).*

Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on state-selected ELP assessments: **34,623**

3. *Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) [number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)].*

Total number of students **identified** as LEP on state-selected ELP assessments: **32,588**

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.**

State Response

Wisconsin and our WIDA consortium partner states are in a transition period as a new, standards-based ELP test is currently being developed for final roll out in spring 2005. During this transition period, we must rely on currently available English proficiency tests. Wisconsin permits the use of four such tests: the Language Assessment Scales, The Idea Proficiency Test, the MAC II, and the Woodcock-Muñoz. These tests are not fully linked to consortium academic standards. Nonetheless, we have conducted proficiency standards-setting sessions on all four instruments using the Modified Anghoff procedure to ensure that our interim ELP tests match our ELP performance definitions and proficiency continuum definitions (see Appendix B—Final Report: Standards (Cutpoint)-Setting on the LAS and IPT Exams for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction). Based on the ELP standards-setting sessions, we have created cut scores and corresponding AMAOs in English that the SEA and LEAs can use to determine whether ELLs are annually making adequate progress in learning English.

Wisconsin believes that schools should move ELLs to full English proficiency within the five to seven years recommended by the National Research Council (August and Hakuta, 1997) and we have set our AMAOs within this average time framework. Our state definition of English proficiency includes the high level academic language skills necessary to perform grade-level academic work and reach proficient or above on large-scale academic assessments of student progress. Data from our most effective schools indicate an average time of five to six years of program support to ensure ELLs have the skills needed to compete with English speaking peers. Research also indicates large variation in time for individual students to reach full proficiency due to a number of factors.

Attached to this workbook Wisconsin has included the test score range (cut scores) for each interim ELP assessment being used. Schools have a maximum of 5-7 years to move students along the continuum to full grade level English proficiency. Wisconsin identifies cohorts based on our five limited-English proficiency designations with level 6 representing fully English proficient. Currently the state collects aggregate data which can provide us with the number and percentage of students advancing across the continuum and reaching level 6. However, within the next two years the state is moving to an individual data system which will make it even easier to track ELL student performance with greater accuracy.

In order to advance across the Wisconsin English proficiency continuum, a student must meet each minimum cut in listening, speaking, reading, and writing subsections (see Appendix A). If one cut is not met, the student remains at the lower level until the test is re-administered and the student meets cuts in all areas. The domain "comprehension" is considered to be a composite of listening and reading scores. Thus, ELP progress must be made in all domains in order for schools to get credit for student advancement.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

State Response

Proficiency levels and sublevels have been defined in an effort to facilitate the reporting of progress toward reaching full English proficiency, level 6. For purposes of meeting AMAOs in English, students must annually advance at least one step on the following scale:

Level 1 to Level 2
Level 2 to Level 2.5
Level 2.5 to Level 3
Level 3 to Level 3.5
Level 3.5 to Level 4, and so on.

(See Appendix C for a description of English language proficiency levels.)

Each year, at least 90% of students will progress from one level to the next.

The steps are set to account for individual student variance in rate of English acquisition as recommended in research, but schools have a maximum of five to seven years to move students to full English proficiency (level 6) (see Appendix A for corresponding scores on Wisconsin's four interim English proficiency assessments). For levels 1-3, schools rely solely on the interim English proficiency assessment instruments scores in assessing advancement toward English proficiency. However, due to the limitations of these interim measures, teacher judgment is allowed as a confirming or disconfirming factor at higher English proficiency levels. Teacher judgment is based on support program area and classroom academic work in the areas of English language arts, math, science and social studies.

In order to advance across the Wisconsin English proficiency continuum, a student must meet each minimum cut in listening, speaking, reading, and writing subsections (see Appendix A). If one cut is not met, the student remains at the lower level until the test is re-administered and the student meets cuts in all areas. The domain "comprehension" is considered to be a composite of listening and reading scores. Thus, ELP progress must be made in all domains in order for schools to get credit for student advancement.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- *The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English*
- *The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency*

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

State Response

See Appendix C—English Language Proficiency Levels.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** Wisconsin will have 6 cohorts, one for each of its 6 levels of English language proficiency (Beginner/Pre-Production through Fully English Proficient)

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

Cohort: ELP Level 1: Beginner/Pre-Production			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	5483	0	0
2004-05	548	4935	0
2005-06	55	5428	0
2006-07	5	5478	0
2007-08	1	5482	0

Cohort: ELP Level 2: Beginner/Production			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	4759	0	0
2004-05	476	4283	0
2005-06	48	4711	0
2006-07	5	4754	0
2007-08	0	4759	0

Cohort: ELP Level 3: Intermediate			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	8101	0	0
2004-05	810	7291	0
2005-06	81	8020	0
2006-07	8	8093	0
2007-08	1	8100	0

Cohort: ELP Level 4: Advanced Intermediate			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	7829	0	0
2004-05	783	7046	0
2005-06	78	7751	0
2006-07	8	7821	0
2007-08	1	2692	5137

Cohort: ELP Level 5: Advanced			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	6416	0	0
2004-05	642	5774	0
2005-06	64	1155	5197
2006-07	6	173	6236
2007-08	1	23	6392

Cohort: ELP Level 6: Fully English Proficient			
	English Language Proficiency Targets	% or No. of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	% or No. of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-04	2035	0	2035
2004-05	2035	0	2035
2005-06	7232	0	7232
2006-07	13468	0	13468
2007-08	24997	0	24997

Note: For purposes of data collection, Wisconsin has two fully English proficient levels – only Level 6 is relevant for this application:

- Level 6: formerly limited-English proficient students who have been reclassified as fully English proficient
- Level 7: fully English proficient students who were never limited-English proficient

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: *The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).*

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and require states to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (Section 9101(11)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. *In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.*

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the state and for high-poverty schools in the state in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline	98.6%	96.9%
2003-2004 Target	99%	97.9%
2004-2005 Target	99.5%	98.9%
2005-2006 Target	100%	100%

B. *to best understand the data provided by states, please provide the state’s definition of a highly qualified teacher below.*

The ESEA reauthorization requires that all teachers in core academic subjects be or become “highly qualified” by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. The law separates teachers into categories of “new to the profession” and “not new to the profession.” The law also separates teachers into two levels. These are “elementary” and “middle or secondary school.” No definition is provided to differentiate the levels. Wisconsin has determined the following for teachers in our public schools:

1. **Elementary teachers not new** to the profession. These are current teachers who are assigned self-contained classrooms in grades 1-8 who teach all subjects. All fully licensed elementary teachers in Wisconsin are “highly qualified” according to the ESEA definition because they have full State certification as a teacher; have not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis; and they hold at least a bachelor’s degree. Subject competence can be documented by a “high objective uniform State standard of evaluation that...is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills.” This last qualifier for teachers is the HOUSE option (i.e. “high objective uniform State standards of evaluation”). Wisconsin standards that meet the HOUSE criteria are in the program approval requirements. All teachers licensed in Wisconsin must have completed an approved program at a college or university, either in this state or in another state. Therefore all current elementary school teachers who teach core academic subjects are in the HOUSE.
2. **Elementary teachers new** to the profession. This means anyone who is in their first teaching job and was hired after the first school day of the 2002-2003 school year (or hired after January 8, 2002 for Title I schools). In order to be “highly qualified” new elementary teachers must meet the criteria in #1 and, in addition, provide evidence that they have “demonstrated subject knowledge and teaching skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum... which may consist of a passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of the basic elementary school curriculum.” PI 34 requires that prospective elementary teachers take a content test to qualify for a license beginning in 2004-2005. In the interim, students are being assessed (taking tests) in all areas they will be teaching as part of the PI 34 approved program being completed.
3. **Middle and secondary teachers not new** to the profession. Middle school and high school teachers teaching now are considered “highly qualified” since they hold at least a bachelor’s degree and they are able to demonstrate “competence in all the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches based on a high objective uniform State standard of evaluation that...is set by the State for both grade appropriate academic subject matter knowledge and teaching skills.” This last qualifier for teachers is the HOUSE option (i.e. “high objective uniform State Standards of evaluation”). Wisconsin standards that meet the HOUSE criteria are in the program approval requirements. All teachers licensed in Wisconsin must have completed an approved program at a college or university, either in this state or in another state. All current middle and high school teachers who teach core academic subjects are in the HOUSE.
4. **Middle and secondary teachers new** to the profession. This includes those hired after the first day of school in 2002-2003. In order to be “highly qualified” the teacher must hold at least a bachelor’s degree and have demonstrated a high level of competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches by “passing a rigorous State academic subject test in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches (which may consist of a passing level of performance on a State-required certification or licensing test or tests in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches); or...successful completion, in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, of an academic major, a graduate degree, coursework equivalent to an undergraduate academic major, or advanced certification or credentialing.” PI 34 requires that middle and secondary teachers take a content test in the subject or subjects they intend to teach beginning in 2004-2005. In the interim, students are taking “tests in each of the academic subjects” they will be teaching as part of the PI 34 approved program being completed.

5. Teachers on **emergency** licenses. Chapter PI 34 allows districts to request special licenses and permits for teachers not fully licensed in emergency situations. Teachers on emergency licenses may be considered “highly qualified” if they are enrolled in a state approved alternative teacher training program that meets federal criteria. This includes high quality professional development before and while teaching, supervision or mentoring while teaching and completing the program in three years or fewer. By definition, any emergency licensed teacher who has enrolled in a DPI approved program to move to full licensure and who completes the required number of credits may qualify.
6. **Special education** teachers. Special education teachers who are teaching core academic subjects must give evidence of being “highly qualified.” Special education teachers not new to the profession are highly qualified if they hold the regular license for their assignment. They qualify through the HOUSE requirement. New special education teachers will be required to take a licensing content test in the basic subjects under PI 34 and will qualify through the test requirement. Special education teachers on emergency licenses may qualify by enrolling in a state approved alternative training program as outlined in #5 above.
7. **Charter** school teachers. The regulations in ESEA state that “Highly Qualified...when used with respect to any teacher teaching in a public charter school...means that the teacher meets the requirements set forth in the State’s public charter school law.” Wisconsin has a charter school license under PI 34 that is authorized in statute. The charter school license may be added to a teacher’s existing license for the purpose of teaching in a public charter school. Teachers who teach core academic subjects in charter schools and who hold the license in that subject area or who hold the charter school license are highly qualified.
8. **Alternative** program teachers. Teachers teaching in alternative programs as defined in statute meet the “highly qualified” requirement in three ways. First they may be teaching in the content area for which they hold a regular license; second they may be teaching in collaboration with a properly licensed teacher; and third they may be teaching an integrated curriculum for students with alternative learning styles for which they have completed an approved program or have the threshold experience in the alternative education content area to qualify for the State alternative education program teacher license.
9. **Substitute** teachers. Short term substitute teachers do not need to be “highly qualified.” Both Wisconsin rules and ESEA mandates allow 20 days in one assignment to be considered “short-term substitute teaching.” If an individual who is not licensed in the subject area or at the level of assignment is in a long term substitute teaching role they must acquire a one-year permit for that assignment. To be considered “highly qualified” they must enroll in an alternative program as outlined in #5 above. If they are not enrolled in a program school officials are required to notify parents of students in their classes that the students are being taught by a teacher who is not “highly qualified” by federal standards.

In Wisconsin “highly qualified” for the purpose of meeting the requirements of ESEA means:

A highly qualified teacher meets all of the requirements of PI 34 for the subjects and levels that he /she is teaching. The requirements include but are not limited to a bachelor's degree, completion of an approved licensing program, and a rigorous exam in the subjects being taught. In addition, a highly qualified teacher may be a teacher of record who is enrolled in a State-approved alternative teacher training program.

Teachers who are not licensed for their assignment or teachers with special licenses or permits who are not enrolled in an alternative training program **are not** highly qualified.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: *The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)*

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIlguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	100%
2003-2004 Target	100%
2004-2005 Target	100%
2005-2006 Target	100%

The DPI does not currently collect data on the percentage of teachers that receive high-quality professional development annually. Per Wis. Stat. 121.02(1)(b), “School district standards. Except as provided in s. 188.40(2r)(d), each school board shall:...Annually establish with school board employees a professional staff development plan designed to meet the needs of individuals or curriculum areas in each school.”

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: *The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)*

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	35%
2003-2004 Target	65%
2004-2005 Target	85%
2005-2006 Target	100%

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: *The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.*

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: *The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.*

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,

- *Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and*
- *Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.*

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline
All Students	90.83
African American/Black	59.87
American Indian/Native Alaskan	76.82
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.08
Hispanic	74.98
White	94.58
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	89.34
Female	92.33

* DPI does not currently collect disaggregated data for all the reporting groups. DPI is developing an individual student record system to collect the required information. This system will be in place in the fall of 2004. Baseline data will be established in the first year of data collection and state performance targets for graduation rate will be established.

Performance Targets: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	91	91	91	92	93	93	93	95	95	95	97	98
African American/Black	60	60	60	65	70	70	70	80	80	80	90	98
American Indian/Native Alaskan	77	77	77	80	83	83	83	89	89	89	95	98
Asian/Pacific Islander	91	91	91	92	93	93	93	95	95	95	97	98
Hispanic	75	75	75	80	84	84	84	87	87	87	95	98
White	95	95	95	96	96	96	96	97	97	97	98	98
Other												
*Students with Disabilities												
*Students without Disabilities												
*Limited English Proficient												
*Economically Disadvantaged												
*Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant												
Male	90	90	90	91	93	93	93	95	95	95	97	98
Female	93	93	93	94	94	94	94	96	96	97	98	98

* DPI does not currently collect disaggregated data for all the reporting groups. DPI is developing an individual student record system to collect the required information. This system will be in place in the fall of 2004. Baseline data will be established in the first year of data collection and state performance targets for graduation rate will be established.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: *The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.*

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, states should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the state high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the state high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	2001-02 Baseline
All Students	1.492
African American/Black	6.416
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.013
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.370
Hispanic	4.366
White	0.840
Other	
Students with Disabilities	
Students without Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	1.661
Female	1.314

* DPI does not currently collect disaggregated data for all the reporting groups. DPI is developing an individual student record system to collect the required information. This system will be in place in the fall of 2004. Baseline data will be established in the first year of data collection and state performance targets for dropout rate will be established.

Performance Targets: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0
African American/Black	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	1.0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0
Hispanic	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	0
White	.84	.84	.84	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.2	0
Other												
*Students with Disabilities												
*Students without Disabilities												
*Limited English Proficient												
*Economically Disadvantaged												
*Non-Economically Disadvantaged												
Migrant												
Male	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0
Female	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0

* DPI does not currently collect disaggregated data for all the reporting groups. DPI is developing an individual student record system to collect the required information. This system will be in place in the fall of 2004. Baseline data will be established in the first year of data collection and state performance targets for dropout rate will be established.

Appendix A

Conversion Charts for Wisconsin English Language Learner (ELL) Student Levels

The federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 requires districts to annually assess the English proficiency gains of all English language learners (ELL). To that end, state educational agencies (SEAs) must establish annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for English language proficiency and report gains in a consistent manner to demonstrate that students are meeting the AMAOs. The AMAOs represent annual goals for student growth in English language proficiency.

The following conversion charts will assist teachers and administrators in meeting the requirement to assess English language proficiency and progress and report the results in a consistent manner. The charts provide the scores for Wisconsin's four approved English language proficiency assessment instruments that correspond to the state's definition of English proficiency at each of five levels and at the midpoint between levels. The level 3 scores are especially significant as this is the point at which ELL students must take the Wisconsin Reading Comprehension Test (WRCT) and the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Exam (WKCE), with accommodations as allowable and needed. ELL students scoring below level 3 may participate in WRCT or WKCE but must participate in alternate assessment as required under PI-13.

Using the Cut Scores

English language proficiency cut scores serve several purposes. First, by correlating test scores with proficiency levels, the charts help teachers place students in the levels in which they can secure the services that best meet their students' language and academic needs. Second, by providing an interval step between each proficiency level, teachers, administrators and families can see that even though a student may not advance a whole level from one year to the next, they can still note progress within a level. For example, a student may remain at proficiency level 2 for two years, seemingly making no progress. However, his or her test scores may reveal that he or she has advanced from a "low" level 2 to a "high" level 2 (2.5), demonstrating progress. Finally, cut scores can give teachers, administrators and families realistic expectations of student progress over time. A kindergarten student beginning school at English proficiency level 1 can be expected to reach level 3 by third or fourth grade if the student continues to make adequate yearly progress.

The cut scores were first established through a standards-setting process using a procedure known as a *Modified Angoff*. The scores were then compared to the test publishers' technical manuals to arrive at final scores that would be both consistent across tests to the extent possible and reflective of the Wisconsin limited English proficiency definitions.

In the pages that follow, cut scores are given for each of the four state-approved tests—IPT, LAS, MAC II, and Woodcock-Muñoz—for each language proficiency level at each grade level or grade level cluster. To determine a student's English language proficiency level based upon test scores, find the column that corresponds to the student's grade level and then locate his or her oral, listening, reading and writing scores (as applicable) within the grade level column. The score at the *lowest* level determines the student's proficiency level. Scores for the individual skills tested should **not** be averaged together.

Examples

If Chung Min, a third grade student, took the IPT 2 test and obtained a level D on the oral test (English language proficiency level 3), a score of 31 on the reading test (proficiency level 3) and a 9 on the writing test (proficiency level 2), Chung Min would be classified as proficient at level 2. Chung Min's oral and reading scores are at the proficiency level 3 for his grade, but his writing score is at level 2. Therefore, he must be classified at the level of his lowest score. To determine Chung Min's progress over time, compare his current scores with his scores from the test taken in second grade. His expected annual growth should be no less than one half of a level. Ideally, he should have moved from level 1.5 to level 2.

Similarly, if Maria, a tenth grade student, obtained the following scores on the MAC II test: speaking 222 (proficiency level 4); listening, 201 (proficiency level 3.5), reading, 216 (proficiency level 3); and writing, 200 (proficiency level 2.5), she would be classified as level 2 because her writing score, the lowest of the four scores, falls within the level 2 range. Please note that if a student's score falls in the upper range of a given level (1.5, 2.5, 3.5, or 4.5) the student's proficiency level is reported to the state as a whole number. For example, if a student scored 58 on the LAS reading test, which is 2.5 on the chart, he or she should be reported to the state as a level 2 student; the level is **not** rounded up. However, schools and districts should keep track of the more detailed English proficiency level designation.

To determine a student's annual progress, locate last year's scores and compare them with the student's most recent scores for his or her grade level. If the student has moved up at least a half level, he or she can be said to be meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency.

IPT 2003 Cut Scores

Prof. Level	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade	Fourth Grade	Grades 5 - 6	Grades 7 - 12
1	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B Early Lit Rdg 0-15 Early Lit Wrtg 0-9	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B Early Lit Rdg 0-25 Early Lit Wrtg 0-11	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B IPT 1 Rdg 0 - 15 IPT 1 Wrtg 0-6	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B IPT 1 Rdg 0 - 20 IPT 1 Wrtg 0-8	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B IPT 2 Rdg 0 - 20 IPT 2 Wrtg 0-6	Oral IPT 1 Level A-B IPT 2 Rdg 0 - 20 IPT 2 Wrtg 0-5	Oral IPT 2 Level A IPT 3 Rdg 0 - 20 IPT 3 Wrtg 0-2
2	Oral IPT 1 Level C Early Lit Rdg 16-20 Early Lit Wrtg 10-11	Oral IPT 1 Level C Early Lit Rdg 26-33 Early Lit Wrtg 12-13	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 1 Rdg 16 - 20 IPT1Wrtg 7 - 9	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 1 Rdg 21 - 25 IPT1 Wrtg 9 - 10	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 2 Rdg 21-23 IPT2 Wrtg 7 - 8	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 2 Rdg 21 -24 IPT2 Wrtg 6 - 7	Oral IPT 2 Level B IPT 3 Rdg 21-25 IPT3 Wrtg 3 - 4
2.5	Oral IPT Level C Early Lit. Rdg 20 - 25 Early Lit. Wrtg 12	Oral IPT Level C Early Lit. Rdg 34 - 40 Early Lit. Wrtg 14	Oral IPT Level C IPT 1. Rdg 21 - 25 IPT 1. Wrtg 10 - 11	Oral IPT Level C IPT 1. Rdg 26 - 28 IPT 1 Wrtg 11 - 12	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 2 Rdg 24 - 26 IPT 2 Wrtg 9 - 11	Oral IPT 1 Level C IPT 2 Rdg 25 - 28 IPT 2 Wrtg 8 - 9	Oral IPT 2 Level B IPT 3 Rdg 26 -30 IPT 3 Wrtg 5 - 6
3	Oral IPT 1 Level D Early Lit Rdg 26-30 Early Lit Wrtg 13	Oral IPT 1 Level D Early Lit Rdg 41-45 Early Lit Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 1 Rdg 26 - 30 IPT 1 Wrtg 12	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 1Rdg 29 - 33 IPT 1 Wrtg 13	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 2 Rdg 27 - 28 IPT 2 Wrtg 12 - 13	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 2 Rdg 29 - 32 IPT 2 Wrtg 10 - 11	Oral IPT 2 Level C IPT 3 Rdg 31-35 IPT 3 Wrtg 7 - 8
3.5	Oral IPT Level D Early Lit Rdg 31 - 34 Early Litwrt 13	Oral IPT Level D Early Lit Rdg 46 - 50 Early Litwrt 16	Oral IPT Level D IPT 1 Rdg 31 - 33 IPT 1 Wrtg 13	Oral IPT Level D IPT 1 Rdg 34 - 38 IPT 1wrtg 14	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 2 Rdg 29 -30 IPT 2 Wrtg 14	Oral IPT 1 Level D IPT 2 Rdg 33 - 35 IPT 2 Wrtg 12	Oral IPT 2 Level C IPT 3 Rdg 36 - 38 IPT 3 Wrtg 9 - 10
4	Oral IPT 1 Level E Early Lit Rdg 35-37 Early Lit Wrtg 14	Oral IPT 1 Level E Early Lit Rdg 51-53 Early Lit Wrtg 17	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 1 Rdg 34 - 36 IPT 1 Wrtg 14	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 1 Rdg 39 - 41 IPT 1 Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 2 Rdg 31- 33 IPT 2 Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 2 Rdg 36 - 38 IPT 2 Wrtg 13 - 14	Oral IPT 2 Level D IPT 3 Rdg 39-42 IPT 3 Wrtg 11 - 12
4.5	Oral IPT 1 Level E Early Lit Rdg 38 - 40 Early Lit Wrtg 14	Oral IPT 1 Level E Early Lit Rdg 54 - 57 Early Lit Wrtg 18	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 1 Rdg 37 40 IPT 1 Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 1 Rdg 42 - 45 IPT 1 Wrtg 16	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 2 Rdg 34 -38 IPT 2 Wrtg 16	Oral IPT 1 Level E IPT 2 Rdg 39 - 43 IPT 2 Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 2 Level D IPT 3 Rdg 43- 46 IPT 3 Wrtg 13 - 15
5	Oral IPT 1 Level F Early Lit Rdg 41-44 Early Lit Wrtg 15	Oral IPT 1 Level F Early Lit Rdg 58-60 Early Lit Wrtg 19-20	Oral IPT 1 Level F IPT 1 Rdg 41 - 50 IPT 1 Wrtg 16 - 18	Oral IPT 1 Level F IPT 1 Rdg 46 - 50 IPT 1 Wrtg 17 - 18	Oral IPT 1 Level F IPT 2 Rdg 38 - 45 IPT 2 Wrtg 17 - 18	Oral IPT 1 Level F IPT 2 Rdg 44 - 47 IPT 2 Wrtg 16 - 18	Oral IPT 2 Level E IPT 3 Rdg 47-50 IPT 3 Wrtg 16 - 18
EXIT	Early Lit Rdg 45	Early Lit Rdg over 60 Early Lit Wrtg over 20	IPT 1 Rdg 51 IPT 1 Wrtg 19	IPT 1 Rdg 51 IPT 1 Wrtg 19	IPT 2 Rdg over 45 IPT 2 Wrtg 19	IPT 2 Rdg over 47 IPT 2 Wrtg 19	IPT 3 Rdg over 50 IPT 3 Wrtg over 18

LEP 1 students in grades k-3 are expected to make at least 7 points of progress in reading and at least 4 points of progress in writing.

LEP 1 students in grades 4-12 should make at least 10 points progress in reading and 2 in writing.

LAS Test 2003 Cut Scores

Proficiency Level	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Grade 3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-12
1	Pre-LAS 0-44	LAS Oral 1C 0-44	LAS-Oral 1C 0-44	LAS-Oral 1C 0-44	LAS-Oral 2C 0-44	LAS-Oral 3C 0-44
1.5	Pre-LAS 45-100	LAS-Oral 45-74	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2		LAS-Oral 75-100	LAS-Oral 1C 45-68	LAS-Oral 1C 45-68	LAS-Oral 2C 45-68	LAS-Oral 3C 45-66
2.5			LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 0-58 – Wr. 0-57	LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 0-58 – Wr. 0-57	LAS-Oral-2C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-2A Rdg 0-58 – Wr. 0-57	LAS-Oral 3C 67 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 0-58 – Wr. 0-57
3	*	*	LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 59 – Writing 58	LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 59 – Writing 58	LAS-Oral 2C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-2A Rdg 59 – Writing 58	LAS-Oral 3C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-3A Rdg 59 – Writing 58
3.5			LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 66 – Writing 65	LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-1A Rdg 66 – Writing 65	LAS-Oral 2C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-2A Rdg 66 – Writing 65	LAS-Oral 3C 69 minimum score LAS R/W-3A Rdg 66 – Writing 65
4			LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W 1A Rdg 72 – Writing 71	LAS-Oral 1C 69 minimum score LAS R/W 1A Rdg 72 – Writing 71	LAS-Oral 2C 69 minimum score LAS R/W 2A Rdg 72 – Writing 71	LAS-Oral 3C 69 minimum score LAS R/W 3A Rdg 72 – Writing 71
5			LAS-Oral 1C 75-100 LAS R/W 1A Rdg 81 – Writing 80	LAS-Oral 1C 75-100 LAS R/W 1A Rdg 81 – Writing 80	LAS-Oral 2C 75-100 LAS R/W 2A Rdg 81 – Writing 80	LAS-Oral 3C 75-100 LAS R/W 3A Rdg 81 – Writing 80
Exit				Passage of 1 year's time after LAU 5 Designation	Passage of 1 year's time after LAU 5 Designation	Passage of 1 year's time after LAU 5 Designation

*Under current guidelines a kindergarten or 1st grader cannot be designated higher than LAU 2.

MAC II 2003 Cut Scores

Proficiency Level	Kindergarten	Grade 1	Grades 2-3	Grades 4-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
1	Speaking: 0-182 Listening: 0-156 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 114-182 Listening: 97-156 Reading: 0-112 Writing: 0-168	Speaking: 113-173 Listening: 79-150 Reading: 0-109 Writing: 0-119	Speaking: 107-180 Listening: 96-178 Reading: 0-119 Writing: 0-111	Speaking: 121-163 Listening: 99-159 Reading: 0-112 Writing: 0-115	Speaking: 103-161 Listening: 105-181 Reading: 0-101 Writing: 0-112
2	Speaking: 183-191 Listening: 157-166 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 183-190 Listening: 157-164 Reading: 113-162 Writing: 169-200	Speaking: 174-181 Listening: 151-158 Reading: 110-157 Writing: 120-165	Speaking: 181-184 Listening: 179-184 Reading: 120-167 Writing: 112-158	Speaking: 164-173 Listening: 160-168 Reading: 113-160 Writing: 116-159	Speaking: 162-176 Listening: 182-187 Reading: 102-155 Writing: 113-160
2.5	Speaking: 192-200 Listening: 167-176 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 191-197 Listening: 165-171 Reading: 163-211 Writing: 201-231	Speaking: 182-187 Listening: 159-165 Reading: 158-203 Writing: 166-210	Speaking: 185-186 Listening: 185-188 Reading: 168-214 Writing: 159-204	Speaking: 174-182 Listening: 169-176 Reading: 161-206 Writing: 160-201	Speaking: 177-190 Listening: 188-191 Reading: 156-208 Writing: 161-207
3	Speaking: 201-205 Listening: 177-185 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 198-202 Listening: 172-179 Reading: 212-218 Writing: 232-237	Speaking: 188-192 Listening: 166-174 Reading: 204-210 Writing: 211-218	Speaking: 187-190 Listening: 189-191 Reading: 215-220 Writing: 205-212	Speaking: 183-190 Listening: 177-183 Reading: 207-213 Writing: 202-208	Speaking: 191-206 Listening: 192-199 Reading: 209-216 Writing: 208-216
3.5	Speaking: 206-209 Listening: 186-194 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 203-205 Listening: 180-186 Reading: 219-224 Writing: 238-242	Speaking: 193-195 Listening: 175-181 Reading: 211-216 Writing: 219-224	Speaking: 191-193 Listening: 192-193 Reading: 221-225 Writing: 213-218	Speaking: 191-197 Listening: 184-189 Reading: 214-219 Writing: 209-214	Speaking: 207-221 Listening: 200-206 Reading: 217-222 Writing: 217-223
4	Speaking: 210-213 Listening: 195-203 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 206-209 Listening: 187-191 Reading: 225-232 Writing: 243-248	Speaking: 196-204 Listening: 182-188 Reading: 217-223 Writing: 225-232	Speaking: 194-200 Listening: 194-200 Reading: 226-231 Writing: 219-226	Speaking: 198-207 Listening: 190-202 Reading: 220-227 Writing: 215-221	Speaking: 222-230 Listening: 207-214 Reading: 223-230 Writing: 224-232
4.5	Speaking: 214-216 Listening: 204-210 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 210-211 Listening: 192-194 Reading: 233-238 Writing: 249-253	Speaking: 205-211 Listening: 189-193 Reading: 224-229 Writing: 233-239	Speaking: 201-205 Listening: 201-206 Reading: 232-236 Writing: 227-232	Speaking: 208-215 Listening: 203-214 Reading: 228-233 Writing: 222-227	Speaking: 231-237 Listening: 215-220 Reading: 231-237 Writing: 233-240
5	Speaking: 217-224 Listening: 211-223 Reading: Writing:	Speaking: 212-223 Listening: 195-212 Reading: 239-260 Writing: 254-258	Speaking: 212-245 Listening: 194-207 Reading: 230-252 Writing: 240-260	Speaking: 206-225 Listening: 207-231 Reading: 237-242 Writing: 233-239	Speaking: 216-254 Listening: 215-242 Reading: 234-251 Writing: 228-238	Speaking: 238-271 Listening: 221-245 Reading: 238-249 Writing: 241-250
EXIT	Composite S&L: Fall: 210 Spring: 220	Speaking: 224-above Listening: 213-above Reading: 261-above Writing: 259-above	Speaking: 246-above Listening: 208-above Reading: 253-above Writing: 261-above	Speaking: 226-above Listening: 232-above Reading: 243-above Writing: 240-above	Speaking: 255-above Listening: 243-above Reading: 252-above Writing: 239-above	Speaking: 272-above Listening: 246-above Reading: 250-above Writing: 251-above

Woodcock-Muñoz 2003 Oral Cut Scores

Proficiency	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.0	WM 1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	410-411	410-420	410-429	410-436	410-443	410-448	410-453	410-457	410-461	410-463	410-466	410-469	410-473
1.5	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2
	412-418	421-428	430-436	437-444	444-449	449-455	454-460	458-464	462-468	464-470	467-473	470-477	474-479
2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0
	419-431	429-440	437-449	445-456	450-463	456-468	461-473	465-477	469-481	471-484	474-486	478-489	480-493
2.5	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3
	432-444	441-453	450-462	457-469	464-475	469-480	474-485	478-490	482-493	485-496	487-499	489-502	494-505
3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0
	445-451	454-460	463-469	470-476	476-483	481-488	486-493	491-497	494-500	497-504	500-506	503-509	506-513
3.5	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4
	452-458	461-467	470-476	477-484	484-489	489-495	494-500	498-504	501-508	505-510	507-513	510-517	514-519
4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0
	459-471	468-480	477-489	485-496	490-503	496-508	501-513	505-517	509-520	511-524	514-526	518-529	520-533
4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5
	472-475	481-484	490-493	497-500	504-507	509-512	514-517	518-521	521-524	525-528	527-530	530-533	534-537
5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0
	476-545	485-545	494-545	501-545	508-545	513-545	518-545	522-545	525-545	529-545	531-545	534-545	538-545

WM: Woodcock-Muñoz Test Score; the bold numbers (e.g., 410-411) are W scores, which are derived from the raw scores.

Woodcock-Muñoz 2003 Reading/Writing Cut Scores

Proficiency	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.0	WM 1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	290-339	290-371	290-406	290-423	290-435	290-444	290-452	290-458	290-464	290-469	290-473	290-476	290-480
1.5	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2	WM 1.2
	340-346	372-378	407-413	424-430	436-442	445-452	453-459	459-466	465-471	470-476	474-480	477-483	481-487
2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0	WM 2.0
	347-359	379-391	414-426	431-443	443-455	453-464	460-472	467-478	472-484	477-489	481-493	484-497	488-500
2.5	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3	WM 2.3
	360-373	392-403	427-439	444-456	456-468	465-477	473-485	479-491	485-497	490-502	494-506	498-509	501-512
3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0	WM 3.0
	374-379	404-411	440-446	457-463	469-475	478-484	486-492	492-498	498-504	503-509	507-513	510-516	513-520
3.5	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4	WM 3.4
	380-386	412-418	447-453	464-470	476-482	485-492	493-499	499-506	505-511	510-516	514-520	517-523	521-527
4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0	WM 4.0
	387-399	419-431	454-466	471-483	483-495	493-504	500-512	507-518	512-524	517-529	521-533	524-536	528-540
4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5	WM 4.5
	400-403	432-435	467-470	484-487	496-499	505-508	513-516	519-522	525-528	530-533	534-537	537-540	541-544
5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0	WM 5.0
	404-550	436-550	471-550	488-550	500-550	509-550	517-550	523-550	529-550	534-550	538-550	541-550	545-550

WM: Woodcock-Muñoz Test Score; the bold numbers (e.g., 410-411) are W scores, which are derived from the raw scores.

Appendix B

Final Report: Standards (Cutpoint)-Setting on the LAS and IPT Exams for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction can be found at
<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/esea/doc/standards.doc>

Appendix C

English Language Proficiency Levels

These descriptions of the six English language proficiency levels are designed to augment the definitions given in PI 13.08(3)(1)-(6), Administrative Rule.

Level 1 – Beginning/Preproduction:

A pupil shall be classified level 1 if the pupil does not understand or speak English with the exception of a few isolated words or expressions.

Level 2 – Beginning/Production:

A pupil shall be classified level 2 if all of the following criteria are met: (a) The pupil understands and speaks conversational and academic English with hesitancy and difficulty. (b) The pupil understands parts of lessons and simple directions. (c) The pupil is at a pre-emergent or emergent level of reading and writing in English, significantly below grade level.

Level 3 – Intermediate:

A pupil shall be classified level 3 if all of the following criteria are met: (a) The pupil understands and speaks conversational and academic English with decreasing hesitancy and difficulty. (b) The pupil is post-emergent, developing reading comprehension and writing skills in English. (c) The pupil's English literacy skills allow the pupil to demonstrate academic knowledge in content areas with assistance.

Level 4 – Advanced Intermediate:

A pupil shall be classified level 4 if all of the following criteria are met: (a) The pupil understands and speaks conversational English without apparent difficulty, but understands and speaks academic English with some hesitancy. (b) The pupil continues to acquire reading and writing skills in content areas needed to achieve grade level expectations with assistance.

Level 5 – Advanced:

A pupil shall be classified level 5 if all of the following criteria are met: (a) The pupil understands and speaks conversational and academic English well. (b) The pupil is near proficient in reading, writing, and content areas skills needed to meet grade level expectations. (c) The pupil requires occasional support.

Level 6 – Formerly LEP now Fully English Proficient:

A pupil shall be classified level 6 if all of the following criteria are met: (a) The pupil was formerly limited-English proficient and is now fully English proficient. (b) The pupil reads, writes, speaks, and comprehends English within the academic classroom setting.